

## REMARKS

Entry of the above amendments and reconsideration of this application are requested. Upon entry of the amendments, this application contains claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-12, 15, 16, 55-58 and 60-67 pending and under consideration. It is believed that the above amendments and the following remarks address each rejection remaining in the case. Allowance is solicited.

Preliminarily, it is noted that each independent claim, other than claim 59 which is allowed, has been amended to include a requirement with respect to leaflet material wrapping around a side element or leg to present leaflet material on an outside of the side element or leg. Support is found, for example, at page 23, line 14 and Figs. 26-26A. As well, each independent claim other than claim 59 has been amended so as to require at least one barb for anchoring, as in prior claim 15.

As noted, the limitation with regard to a barb for anchoring was prior incorporated in claim 15 of the application. This claim was not subject to any 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection, but rather only to 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections. It is believed that the above-mentioned amendments remove all claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102, because the references relied upon for rejecting claims under this statutory section fail to disclose a combination having at least one barb element for anchoring as claimed. Accordingly, withdrawal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is requested for this reason.

With regard to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Applicant remarks as follows.

First, as to the rejection of claims 55-57, 61 and 62 over Andersen in view of Cox, it is noted that neither of these references teaches a barb for anchoring as claimed. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is solicited.

With regard to the rejection of claims 10, 11 and 55-57 over Moll in view of Cox, it is noted that neither of these references, nor their combination, teaches the combination of claimed elements in the rejected claims. In particular, the rejected claims require a combination of a barb for anchoring with the specified attachment along a side element or leg that includes a wrapping of material providing material on an outer side of the side element. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is solicited.

With regard to the rejection of claims 10, 11 and 55-57 over Duran in view of Cox or Peredo, it is noted that this combination of references fails to teach the claimed combination that includes at least one barb for anchoring. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is solicited.

With regard to the rejection of claims 15 and 16 over Moll in view of Bessler, it is noted that this reference combination fails to teach the claimed combination that includes an attachment extending along a side element and having wrapped edge material as claimed, in combination with at least one barb for anchoring the valve. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is solicited.

With regard to the rejection of claims 15 and 16 over Duran in view of Bessler, it is noted that this combination of references fails to teach the claimed combination including the attachment extending along the side element having wrapped material as claimed, in combination with at least one barb for anchoring


the valve.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are solicited.

**Request for Interview**

In the event that the Examiner finds any reason that the application cannot be allowed in its present form, the Applicant wishes to conduct an interview with the Examiner prior to any next Office Action in order to provide an opportunity for coming to agreement upon allowable claims. To arrange the interview, the Examiner should call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number given.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kenneth A. Gandy, Reg. No. 33,886  
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett  
& Henry LLP  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137  
(317) 634-3456